

### **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated 15 August 2005 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

Claims 1-3 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Granados (4103378), Seals (4967435) or Wu (2002/0073490).

However, the Examiner has kindly indicated that claims 4-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, claim 4 which is indicated to be allowable has been deleted, and has been included into claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 to which claim 4 is dependent thereon have also been deleted and have also been included into claim 1.

Claim 5 has been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Claims 6, 7, 8 which are indicated to be allowable have been written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 9 is dependent on the amended claim 8. Claims 10 and 18 are dependent on claim 9. Claims 11, 13 and 17 are dependent on claim 10. Claim 12 is dependent on claim 11. Claims 14, 15 are dependent on claim 13. Claim 16 is dependent on claim 15.

Claim 19 has been amended to be dependent on the amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 5-19 would appear to be allowable,  
and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is accordingly most  
respectfully solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner MEISLIN are  
appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.